# CASE NEG – Trigger Warnings

## 1

#### Text: Public colleges and universities ought to only suggest or require trigger warnings in order to suggest that instructors place trigger warnings on their class syllabuses for material that could potentially trigger students.

#### CP has a net-benefit of PTSD.

Calderon et al 14 Nikki Calderon, Derek Wakefield, and Bailey Loverin (student sponsor). “A Resolution to Mandate Warnings For Triggering Content in Academic Settings” Resolution #805. February 25, 2014. Associated Students Senate: University of California, Santa Barbara. https://www.as.ucsb.edu/senate/resolutions/a-resolution-to-mandate-warnings-for-triggering-content-in-academic-settings/ SA-IB

Whereas: UCSB CARE (Campus Advocacy Resources & Education) reports that: 1 in 4 college women will be sexually assaulted during her academic career,; 1 in 4 women will experience domestic violence; and 1 in 33 men will experience attempted or completed rape. Therefore this is a pertinent and widespread issue that should be acknowledged on campus. (maybe, but this may be better as a separate whereas at the end) Whereas: Triggers are not limited to sexual assault and violence. Whereas: Trigger Warnings should be used for content not covered by the rating system used by the MPAA or TV warnings (such as contains violence, nudity or, language). Whereas: The current suggested list of Trigger Warnings includes Rape, Sexual Assault, Abuse, Self-Injurious Behavior, Suicide, Graphic Violence, Pornography, Kidnapping, and Graphic Depictions of Gore. Whereas: Triggers are a symptom of PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder). Whereas: UCSB Disabled Students Program recognizes PTSD as a disability. Whereas: Having memories or flashbacks triggered can cause the person severe emotional, mental, and even physical distress. These reactions can affect a student’s ability to perform academically. Whereas: College level courses may contain materials with mature content. These particularly affect students if material is being read in the classroom or a film is being screened, as the student cannot choose to stop being exposed to the material. Whereas: Including trigger warnings is not a form of criticism or censorship of content. In addition, it does not restrict academic freedom but simply requests the respect and acknowledgement of the affect of triggering content on students with PTSD, both diagnosed and undiagnosed. Whereas: Being informed well in advance of triggering content allows students to avoid a potentially triggering situation without public attention. Having a trigger warning on a syllabus allows a student the choice to be present gives a student advance notice of possible triggers and the choice to be present or not instead of having to leave in the middle of a class or lecture. Therefore let it be resolved by the Associated Students in the Senate Assembled: That the Associated Students of UC Santa Barbara urge the instructor of any course that includes triggering content to list trigger warnings on the syllabus. Let it further be resolved that: AS Senate urges the instructor of any course that includes triggering content to not dock points from a student’s overall grade for being absent or leaving class early if the reason for the absence is the triggering content.

## 2

#### A] Interpretation: the aff must defend that restrictions are removed for ALL constitutionally protected speech – any means all.

Cambridge Dictionary, Any, http://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/quantifiers/any.

**We use any before nouns to refer to indefinite or unknown quantities or an unlimited entity**: Did you bring any bread? **Mr Jacobson refused to answer any questions.** If I were able to travel back to any place and time in history, I would go to ancient China. **Any as a determiner has two forms: a strong form and a weak form. The forms have different meanings. Weak form any: indefinite quantities We use any for indefinite quantities in questions and negative sentences.** We use some in affirmative sentences: Have you got any eggs? I haven’t got any eggs. I’ve got some eggs. Not: I’ve got any eggs. **We use weak form any only with uncountable nouns or with plural nouns**: [talking about fuel for the car] **Do I need to get any petrol?** (+ uncountable noun) **There aren’t any clean knives.** They’re all in the dishwasher. (+ plural noun) Warning: **We don’t use any with this meaning with singular countable nouns: Have you got any Italian cookery books?** (or … an Italian cookery book?) Not: Have you got any Italian cookery book? Strong form any meaning ‘it does not matter which’ We use any to mean ‘it does not matter which or what’, to describe something which is not limited. We use this meaning of any with all types of nouns and usually in affirmative sentences. In speaking we often stress any:. (+ uncountable noun) When you make a late booking, you don’t know where you’re going to go, do you? It could be any destination. (+ singular countable noun) [talking about a contract for new employees] Do we have any form of agreement with new staff when they start? (+ singular countable noun) [a parent talking to a child about a picture he has painted] A: I don’t think I’ve ever seen you paint such a beautiful picture before. Gosh! Did you choose the colours? B: We could choose any colours we wanted. (+ plural countable noun) See also: Determiners and types of noun Some and any Any as a pronoun Any can be used as a pronoun (without a noun following) when the noun is understood. A: Have you got some £1 coins on you? B: Sorry, I don’t think I have any. (understood: I don’t think I have any £1 coins.) [parents talking about their children’s school homework] A: Do you find that Elizabeth gets lots of homework? Marie gets a lot. B: No not really. She gets hardly any. (understood: She gets hardly any homework.) A: What did you think of the cake? It was delicious, wasn’t it? B: I don’t know. I didn’t get any. (understood: I didn’t get any of the cake.) See also: Determiners used as pronouns Any of We use any with of before articles (a/an, the), demonstratives (this, these), pronouns (you, us) or possessives (his, their): Shall I keep any of these spices? I think they’re all out of date. Not: … any these spices? We use any of to refer to a part of a whole: Are any of you going to the meeting? I couldn’t answer any of these questions. I listen to Abba but I’ve never bought any of their music. **Any** doesn’t have a negative meaning on its own. It **must be used with a negative word to mean the same as no. Compare Not Any: there aren’t any biscuits left.** They’ve eaten them all. **No: There are no biscuits left. They’ve eaten them all.**

#### B] Violation: they specify

#### C] Net Benefits:

#### 1. Limits –

they EXPLODE the topic; they can specify any type of speech in the aff which leads to proliferation of unbeatable affirmatives. Additionally, even if they defend a specific venue, there are still infinite locations or manners that they can specify down to. An under-limited topic kills fairness and education – we’re spread to thin to have good debate and have the ability to engage. Limits outweighs –

Harris 13 Scott, Director of Debate at U Kansas, 2006 National Debate Coach of the Year, Vice President of the American Forensic Association, 2nd speaker at the NDT in 1981. “This ballot.” 5 April 2013. CEDA Forums. http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php?action=dlattach;topic=4762.0;attach=1655

I understand that there has been some criticism of Northwestern’s strategy in this debate round. This criticism is premised on the idea that they ran framework instead of engaging Emporia’s argument about home and the Wiz. I think this criticism is unfair. Northwestern’s framework argument did engage Emporia’s argument. Emporia said that you should vote for the team that performatively and methodologically made debate a home. Northwestern’s argument directly clashed with that contention. My problem in this debate was with aspects of the execution of the argument rather than with the strategy itself. It has always made me angry in debates when people have treated topicality as if it were a less important argument than other arguments in debate. Topicality is a real argument. It is a researched strategy. It is an argument that challenges many affirmatives. The fact that other arguments could be run in a debate or are run in a debate does not make topicality somehow a less important argument. In reality, for many of you that go on to law school you will spend much of your life running topicality arguments because you will find that words in the law matter. The rest of us will experience the ways that word choices matter in contracts, in leases, in writing laws and in many aspects of our lives. Kansas ran an affirmative a few years ago about how the location of a comma in a law led a couple of districts to misinterpret the law into allowing individuals to be incarcerated in jail for two days without having any formal charges filed against them. For those individuals the location of the comma in the law had major consequences. Debates about words are not insignificant. Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. **The limits debate** is an argument that **has real pragmatic consequences**. I found myself earlier this year judging Harvard’s eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, I could put together a strategy against any random argument somebody makes employing an energy metaphor but the reality is there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching. **I would like to** actually **spend time playing catch** with my children occasionally **or** maybe even **read a book or go to a movie** or spend some time with my wife. **A world where there are an infinite number of affirmatives is a world where the demand to have a specific strategy** and not run framework **is a world that says this community doesn’t care whether its participants** have a life or do well in school or spend time with their families. I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic. Broader topics that do not require positive government action or are bidirectional will not make teams that won’t debate the topic choose to debate the topic. I think that is a con job. I am not opposed to broader topics necessarily. I tend to like the way high school topics are written more than the way college topics are written. I just think people who take the meaning of the outcome of this NDT as proof that we need to make it so people get **to talk about anything** they want to talk about without having to debate against Topicality or framework arguments are interested in constructing a world that **might make debate an unending nightmare** and not a very good home in which to live. Limits, to me, are a real impact because I feel their impact in my everyday existence.

#### 2. Ground –

they’re always ahead on the specific type of speech or venue they’ve picked since they have infinite prep time, but under their interp, I lose my ability to make coherent arguments. My interp solves their plans good offense – they can specify types of restrictions, as long as they defend them removed for all speech, which means I can get my generics.

#### 3. Precision –

a) controls the internal link to topical prep, if you’re not under the purview of the topic, there’s no way anyone knows what your aff will be b) it’s not reasonable to have me prep things that aren’t the topic c) topicality rule outweighs

Nebel 15 Jake, debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC. “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/ SA-IB

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the a**ffirmative **must defend the r**esolution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see what is distinctive about topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: it **would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the** resolution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, we ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic** considerations for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

#### D] Voter –

#### No RVIs

1. neg flex – having multiple 2NR outs is key against plans like theirs

2. kills all education because it forces every debate to be decided on theory which means that we are never able to attempt to check abusive practices without every speech being all theory

3. counter-interp: they get an RVI on theory, which solves their offense, topicality is a predictable argument that they should have to beat along with substantive objections to the aff

4. counter-interp: they get an RVI if I read X or more shells – solves enough of their offense and supercharges my arguments

5. no rvi forces the aff to become more efficient at defending their position from a multiplicity of attacks which makes them better debaters and better advocates

## case

### a2 haidt

#### 1 – turn – refusal to provide warnings makes it harder for people to survive.

Finch 15 Sam Dylan Finch (Writer for Everyday Feminism). “When You Oppose Trigger Warnings, You’re Really Saying These 8 Things.” Everyday Feminism. 15 July 2015. HW. http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/07/opposing-trigger-warnings/

3. I Really Want to Make Your Already Difficult Life More Difficult I’ve heard a lot of folks who oppose content warnings saying to me, “Welcome to the real world! If you can’t deal with this article, how are you going to deal with real life?” You don’t need to tell a survivor that “the real world” is hard, because **t**hey already know that. They’re already living in it, trying to survive and trying to heal. And your refusal to include content warnings takes already difficult circumstances and makes them even harder. What’s the problem with making writing, film, and (yes) classrooms more accessible for people with trauma? Even if the rest of the world is going to be a challenge, why add an additional struggle onto their plate? It’s like forcing someone to wear heavy weights while they run a marathon, under the guise that “running is hard, and if you can’t deal with the weight, maybe you shouldn’t run a marathon!” Yes, the real world sucks. Survivors know that better than anyone. So we should work hard to make safe spaces wherever it’s possible to do so – especially when it’s as easy as adding a content warning.

#### 2 – empirically denied – news organizations and other people are now giving content warnings – huff post and other websites provide them in order to prevent people from being shocked by IPV or suicide.

### a2 hinders discussion

#### Group AAUP and Filipovic

#### 1 – this misses the point, trigger warnings don’t demand material be removed, rather the professor ought to give a simple “heads up” for things like rape or hate crimes being discussed.

#### 2 – this only says that professors are scared students will react badly if they read controversial material so

#### a) giving a trigger warning on the syllabus solves students being unhappy

#### b) the aff can’t solve because students will be upset at professors regardless of whether colleges suggest trigger warnings or not.

#### 3 – trigger warnings on syllabuses don’t censor or harm discussion, they actually link turn this argument by better preparing students to deal with the material at hand – this card answers their internal warrants specifically. Independently, PTSD outweighs your offense.

McKinnon 16 Shiloh. “YOUR PROFESSOR IS WRONG ABOUT TRIGGER WARNINGS: Embracing Trigger Warnings for Those Who Need Them” September 15, 2016. http://studybreaks.com/2016/09/15/your-professor-is-wrong-about-trigger-warnings/ SA-IB

So, to begin with, let’s define the term “trigger warning.” Triggers, at least as the mental health community defines them, are almost always linked to PTSD. Mentalhealthamerica.net says, “For people with PTSD, it is very common for their memories to be triggered by sights, sounds, smells or even feelings that they experience. These triggers can bring back memories of the trauma and cause intense emotional and physical reactions, such as raised heart rate, sweating and muscle tension.” So, at it’s most basic definition, a trigger is an input that has the potential to cause a trauma victim to relive some or all of their trauma. The trigger warning debate (along with many PTSD forums) also acknowledges that graphic descriptions and/or scenes relating to a person’s trauma can also be considered a trigger. A “trigger warning” then, is a note on a syllabus or prior to a lecture or on the back of a book that lists potential triggers. For instance, if I were putting together a list of YA book recommendations, I would make sure to list “tw: attempted rape” next to “Divergent.”

[They continue:]

Trigger warnings give students a chance to prepare for disturbing content and make sure that they have a chance to be safe and supported when they do their reading. From the student’s perspective, the only thing lost by receiving trigger warnings is some modicum of surprise when rape suddenly ends up being a plot point in the book they have to read for English. Logically, it follows that a professor that has a problem with trigger warnings values the ability of content to surprise and upset students more than the students’ ability to prepare for class.Well, everyone tells me that art is supposed to be shocking and make you uncomfortable, so even if I don’t agree with the sentiment, at least I understand it. I guess “Titus Andronicus” just doesn’t have the same effect if you know Chiron and Demetrius are going to drag Lavinia into a forest, rape her, then cut out her tongue and hands. (Except that it obviously does, given the a number of people in the audience fainted in one showing, but I suppose that’s neither here nor there). Regardless, that doesn’t appear to be the problem. Take for instance, this example from my intro humanities class. Hum 110 is a class taught by multiple professors that every freshman at my college is required to take. Because of the size of the class, individual professors have very little influence over the syllabus. One day, in response to a debate happening on Facebook, my professor made it very clear that he didn’t believe in trigger warnings. He told us that he thought it was wrong to censor what professors can and cannot teach and he valued the ability of the text to upset and challenge students. The thing is, later that day, when he’s telling the class about the reading for the next lecture, Livy’s “History of Rome,” he tells us to be aware that near the end of the book is a pretty graphic rape scene. He tells us to make sure we take care of ourselves, make some tea or read it during the day, rather than at 2 in the morning the night before the lecture. Then, with no other comment, he dismisses the class and we all go on our merry ways. I don’t think my professor realized, but he had just given the entire class a trigger warning. The man who, earlier that day, had said he was totally against trigger warnings in the classroom, had not only given us all a warning, but also told us to take care of ourselves. Funnily enough, contrary to what a lot of professors seem to expect, everyone in the class did the reading that night. So obviously there’s a disconnect here. My professor sounded almost exactly like the University of Chicago letter, and I believe that that really is what he thinks of trigger warnings, but then he turned around and gave us the very warnings we as students had been asking for. So what’s happening? I’m definitely not suggesting that University of Chicago actually values the idea of trigger warnings; I think its focus on the lack of “safe spaces” in classrooms makes that pretty obvious. But I do think that what professors are afraid of and what students are asking for aren’t the same thing. Let’s go back to the University of Chicago letter for a second. It says, “Members of our community are encouraged to speak, write, listen, challenge and learn, without fear of censorship.” The problem, then, is that Chicago University, along with the professors I’ve talked to, believe that trigger warnings create censorship. How exactly they think that happens depends on the person, but the two most common beliefs I’ve seen are that students simply won’t read triggering material, and that the backlash against a lecture or syllabus that includes triggering material would be so severe that the professor would be forced to remove it from the syllabus. I don’t think that’s ever happened, and given the effort the students at my school have put into trying to change the Hum syllabus already, I doubt that it’s going to, but apparently that’s a common fear. It shouldn’t be though, because trigger warnings actually have nothing to do with censorship. When a student asks for trigger warnings, they’re not asking for a pass on the reading, they’re asking for a heads up so they can best prepare for the reading. Sexual assault survivors deserve to know when they have to read a graphic rape scene, and if it’s appropriate for the class, it’s reasonable for them to skim or just skip those couple of paragraphs. Just because someone knows they’re going to be upset by material doesn’t mean they’re not going to read it. This feels like a silly example, but I know, before certain episodes of “The Walking Dead” that an episode is going to deal with topics that are triggering to me (thanks television content warnings). I then have the option of watching that episode immediately, or saving it for a time when I feel a little more emotionally prepared for those topics. Obviously things are a little different in college, but I think my professor who was so concerned about his students summed it up best. He suggested we take care of ourselves before taking on the triggering material, which seems reasonable enough to me. Maybe that sort of understanding wouldn’t work at Chicago University. I don’t know how much they trust their students, but at my school we operate by the honor principle; professors trust the students to do the work necessary to participate and excel in class. In that sort of environment, trigger warnings should be a foregone conclusion. In a place where the students are trusted to do their work, even at a possibly personal cost, it only makes sense to provide trigger warnings so they can do that work more efficiently and safely. Panic attacks and flashbacks are not only terrible, but they make it incredibly difficult to focus on school. Even in a place that doesn’t trust their students as much as my college, it makes sense to give students trigger warnings. It quite simply gives people who are triggered by material likely to be on a syllabus (like, for instance, rape survivors) better ability to manage their work. Just because trigger warnings aren’t provided doesn’t mean people aren’t going to be triggered. It’s better for everyone, safer for students and healthier for a classroom environment, to give all students the information they need to make the decisions that will benefit them. Sorry, Chicago University, but censorship just doesn’t enter into the discussion.

#### 4 – here’s your Filipovic card recut – it goes neg because the counterplan resolves the harms she discusses.

Filipovic 14 Jill (blogger at Feministe. She holds a JD and BA from New York University) “We’ve gone too far with ‘trigger warnings’” Guardian march 5th 2014 http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/mar/05/trigger-warnings-can-be-counterproductive SA-IB

Which doesn't mean that individual students should not be given mental health accommodations. It's perfectly reasonable for a survivor of violence to ask a professor for a heads up if the reading list includes a piece with graphic descriptions of rape or violence, for example. But generalized trigger warnings aren't so much about helping people with PTSD as they are about a certain kind of performative feminism: they're a low-stakes way to use the right language to identify yourself as conscious of social justice issues. Even better is demanding a trigger warning – that identifies you as even more aware, even more feminist, even more solicitous than the person who failed to adequately provide such a warning.

#### 5 – Filipovic has no impact – she’s talking about how kids want to appear “woke” by calling out professors that don’t offer trigger warnings, so obviously PTSD outweighs.

#### **6 – Filipovic is about colleges demanding professors remove material, but the CP is about offering warnings so students can better prepare, so it resolves this impact.**

### a2 halberstam

#### 1 – there is literally no impact to anything Halberstam is saying – I’ve read this article and its literally him whining about sensitivity and complaining that feminists are too triggered by everything.

#### 2 – his main issue is censorship, but all the other stuff above answers that

#### 3 – his warrant for breaking apart coalitions is that once, the LGBTQ community had a disagreement about reclaiming the word “tranny” – except

#### a) that’s just open discourse within a resistance at to the best method to approach activism and

#### b) no warrant why suggesting trigger warnings on a syllabus does anything like that.

### a2 filipovic overview

#### Filipovic sets up a gender binary when she frames IPV and sexual assault as a woman only issue. She says that women are treated as venerable when we warn about sexual assault, which frames it as a woman only issue.

Truit 14 Jos Executive Director of Feministing in charge of Development, “THE DANGERS OF A GENDER ESSENTIALIST APPROACH TO SEXUAL VIOLENCE”, Feministing, 2014

Rape is absolutely a gendered crime. This is true of how it plays out in the real world, and of our concept of rape – both the act and idea of rape are used to perpetuate a patriarchal gender hierarchy. Violence in general is function and gendered, as Eesha Pandit made clear in her powerful theory of violence. We know sexual violence is overwhelmingly perpetrated by men against women. But we don’t actually know how strong the gender disparity is largely because of how gendered our concept of rape is. The FBI has only recently begun changing their archaic definition of rape from “the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will,” an incredibly narrow definition that means FBI statistics exclude lots of female survivors, and anyone the FBI doesn’t identify as female. Because our idea of sexual violence is gendered in such an essentialist way, we don’t actually have a broad picture of the gendered ways these crimes play out in the real world. This is part of how the gender binary works. It sets up two boxes: one for the people in power – men – and one for the people to oppress – women. Anyone who doesn’t fit our culture’s narrow definitions for man or woman, and anyone who isn’t a man or a woman, falls outside, where it’s difficult to even make people recognize our humanity, let alone our experiences of oppression. There’s a ton of problems with this set up, not the least of which is painting women broadly as victims and men as perpetrators. Another way gendered violence functions is by erasing the many people whose experiences of sexual violence don’t fit this model – survivors who are men (cis or trans), trans women, genderqueer, two spirit, or in some other way gender non-conforming, intersex folks, and survivors of crimes perpetrated by atypical attackers, like survivors of queer relationship violence. Sadly, feminists end up perpetuating this exclusion when we talk about victims only as women and perpetrators only as men. Rape is absolutely a gendered crime, but the act of rape itself doesn’t necessarily follow those rules. We need to be able to hold an understanding of [IPV]rape as a genderless act at the same time that we recognize it as embedded in a gendered culture of violence. No one said feminism was easy. Sadly, Red’s experience is not unique. We have a very hard time recognizing and understanding sexual violence that doesn’t fit the standard narrative. I have to wonder how much this plays into the widespread shocked reaction to cases like that of Jerry Sandusky or the Catholic Church. It’s also been difficult for these cases which involve the abuse of boys to come to light. I have to wonder about the cases involving men we don’t hear about, not to mention cases involving gender non-conforming people, which most of our culture doesn’t even know how to talk about. Lori and I have written a good deal on this site about expanding abortion care to people who aren’t women but who need abortions. As I wrote about that topic: Yes, the majority of people who have abortions are cis women. Recognizing that not everyone who needs to access the procedure is a woman does not erase this fact, or do anything to make abortion less accessible to this majority. I certainly do not want to see women taken out of the discussion at all – I just want to see it expanded to include everyone who’s lived reality includes abortion. But the idea that abortion politics should be focused on cis women because they are the impacted majority is pretty much the opposite of a social justice stance. It’s the people in the margins – usually a minority – who most need their voices and concerns lifted up. Because they are the easiest to forget about, the easiest to exclude. The same is true when it comes to sexual violence. We absolutely must continue highlighting the gendered nature of sexual violence. But it’s vital to do so in a way that doesn’t leave people out. There are real world implications to only seeing victims who are cis women. Respondents to the National Transgender Discrimination Survey reported harassment and denial of equal treatment in domestic violence shelters and rape crisis centers, as well as other health care facilities and at the hands of law enforcement. Trans and gender non-conforming people are often excluded from services all together. I want to be clear: letting the Violence Against Women Act expire is absolutely despicable. As Zerlina highlighted so personally, this legislation funds vital services that real people depend on. While VAWA’s name is very gendered, in principal the legislation is supposed to be gender neutral. In practice, it’s an ongoing process to make sure services VAWA covers reach as many people as possible. In an incredibly disturbing turn, the House GOP’s apparent reason for letting VAWA expire was that it would offer too many services to immigrants, Native Americans, and LGBT folks. Yes, they killed VAWA in an attempt to ensure vital services wouldn’t reach my community. We absolutely need VAWA, and we need to keep expanding its services to people who aren’t cis women. One piece of positive change that has occurred within government: last year, the Department of Justice released national standards to prevent prison rape that include protections for trans and gender non-conforming folks. We need more changes like that, and less changes like killing VAWA because it might help too many LGBT folks. Given how overwhelmingly gendered sexual violence is, it’s easy and understandable to slip into essentialist language when talking about the issue, to paint all victims as women and all perpetrators as men. By missing parts of the reality, we’ve left space for folks like Men’s Rights Activists to fill. Obviously, the feminist take on rape has much more to do with reality than the MRA take. But when you’ve got one side going “what about the menz!” and another side responding “but victims are overwhelmingly women!” you’re having the wrong conversation. As feminists, we need to find ways to do this work that serve everyone who’s been targeted with sexual violence. Violence in general is incredibly gendered in our culture, as Maya wrote in the wake of the Sandy Hook shooting. We absolutely need to be talking about violence and masculinity. We should continue taking to the streets to shout that rape and sexual violence are gendered crimes that are embedded in and perpetuate patriarchy. But we need to work to do this in a way that doesn’t perpetuate the exclusions of the gender binary by leaving victims out.

#### Vote them down.

Vincent 13 Christopher, debate coach, former college NDT debater. “Re-Conceptualizing Our Performances: Accountability In Lincoln Douglas Debate” 2013. SA-IB

Again for debaters of color, their performance is always attached to their body which is why it is important that the performance be viewed in relation to the speech act. Whites are allowed to take for granted the impact their words have on the bodies in the space. They take for granted this notion of personhood and ignore the concerns of those who do not matter **divorced from the flow.** It is never a question of “should we make arguments divorced from our ideologies,” it is a question of is it even possible. It is my argument that our performances, regardless of what justification we provide, are always a reflection of the ideologies we hold. Why should a black debater have to use a utilitarian calculus just to win a round, when that same discourse justifies violence in the community they go back home to? Our performances and our decisions in the round, reflect the beliefs that we hold[.] when we go back to our communities. As a community we must re-conceptualize this distinction the performance by the body and of the body by re-evaluating the role of the speech and the speech act. It is no longer enough for judges to vote off of the flow anymore. Students of color are being held to a higher threshold to better articulate why racism is bad, which is the problem in a space that we deem to be educational. It is here where I shift my focus to a solution. Debaters must be held accountable for the words they say in the round. We should no longer evaluate the speech. Instead we must begin to evaluate the speech act itself. Debaters must be held accountable for more than winning the debate. They must be held accountable for the implications of that speech. As educators and adjudicators in the debate space we also have an ethical obligation to foster an atmosphere of education. It is not enough for judges to offer predispositions suggesting that they do not endorse racist, sexist, homophobic discourse, or justify why they do not hold that belief, and still offer a rational reason why they voted for it. Judges have become complacent in voting on the discourse, if the other debater does not provide a clear enough role of the ballot framing, or does not articulate well enough why the racist discourse should be rejected. Judges must be willing to foster a learning atmosphere by holding debaters accountable for what they say in the round. They must be willing to vote against a debater if they endorse racist discourse. They must be willing to disrupt the process of the flow for the purpose of embracing that teachable moment. The speech must be connected to the speech act. We must view the entire debate as a performance of the body, instead of the argument solely on the flow**.** Likewise, judges must be held accountable for what they vote for in the debate space. If a judge is comfortable enough to vote for discourse that is racist, sexist, or homophobic, they must also be prepared to defend their actions. We as a community do not live in a vacuum and do not live isolated from the larger society. That means that judges must defend their actions to the debaters, their coaches, and to the other judges in the room if it is a panel. Students of color should not have the burden of articulating why racist discourse must be rejected, but should have the assurance that the educator with the ballot will protect them in those moments. Until we re-conceptualize the speech and the speech act, and until judges are comfortable enough to vote down debaters for a performance that perpetuates violence in the debate space, debaters and coaches alike will remain complacent in their privilege. As educators we must begin to shift the paradigm and be comfortable doing this. As a community we should stop looking at ourselves as isolated in a vacuum and recognize that the discourse and knowledge we produce in debate has real implications for how we think when we leave this space. Our performances must be viewed as of the body instead of just by it. As long as we continue to operate in a world where our performances are merely by bodies, we will continue to foster a climate of hostility and violence towards students of color, and in turn destroy the transformative potential this community could have.

#### Vote on this before the role of the ballot –

#### a) it’s a prior question to maintain good education in this space

#### b) other rounds solve your offense

#### c) all your stuff is state good specific, while I’m just saying you should be dropped for perpetuating a dangerous gender binary.

#### A2 Bryant – I meet this, my concrete option is dropping you.

### a2 Filipovic

#### 1 – alt causes and no impact to a hierarchy – PTSD outweighs.

#### 2 – this says we treat survivors as vulnerable when we give trigger warnings, this is obviously not the case, as there is documentation of PTSD and being triggered with rape specifically.

#### 3 – this is classic all lives matter – she’s saying that we’re treating marginalized groups like they deserve special attention when we literally make sure they don’t have PTSD and are prepared to engage.

#### 4 – trigger warnings don’t assume everyone is vulnerable, rather they give everyone the opportunity to determine they are ready for the material.

### a2 waters

#### 1 – exposure may be good in a controlled psychologist setting, but definitely not the classroom – trigger warnings are good on syllabuses.

McKinnon 16 Shiloh. “YOUR PROFESSOR IS WRONG ABOUT TRIGGER WARNINGS: Embracing Trigger Warnings for Those Who Need Them” September 15, 2016. http://studybreaks.com/2016/09/15/your-professor-is-wrong-about-trigger-warnings/ SA-IB

With that definition, maybe you can see why students would request trigger warnings for their assigned reading. While it’s true that exposure therapy is a common technique used to begin to treat the symptoms of PTSD, it’s a complex process that can’t be forced and should be overseen by a professional. The classroom, or perhaps the dorm room, is not the place to attempt professional PTSD therapeutic techniques.

#### 2 – link turn, your professor talks about exposure being like vaccines, where we expose you to small amounts of triggering materials in order to better help you deal with it, but I’m pretty sure your doctor TELLS YOU before they jam a needle in your arm. A trigger warning doesn’t limit exposure, rather warns the student they’re about to receive it. It might be good to expose people to material that trigger them, but you really shouldn’t surprise a rape survivor with a video of violent rape WITHOUT TELLING THEM.